

Re



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/992,109	11/06/2001	Andrew Divaker ShamRao		7475

7590 10/28/2004
Andrew Divaker ShamRao
2901 S. Michigan Ave. #905
Chicago, IL 60616

EXAMINER

LU, KUEN S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2167

DATE MAILED: 10/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/992,109	Applicant(s) SHAMRAO, ANDREW DIVAKER	
	Examiner Kuen S Lu	Art Unit 2167	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 June 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendments

1. In responding to Applicants' amendments made to the claims, filed on June 8, 2004, the amendment of claims 1, 17 and 19 in which new issue was introduced has been noted by the Examiner.
2. As for claims 1 to 20, the Examiner has created a Final Rejection Office Action as shown next wherein new references were introduced to provide teaching for rejecting the issue introduced in the amendment.
3. As for the Applicant's REMARKS, filed on June 8, 2004, has been fully considered by the Examiner. For the Examiner's response, please see discussion in the section **Response to Arguments**, following the Office Action for Final Rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
5. Claims 1-4, 9 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ordinak et al. (U.S. Pub. 2002/0173889, hereafter "Ordinak") in view of Turner et al. (U.S. Pub. 2003/0191650, hereafter "Turner").

As per claim 1, Ordinak teaches the following:

"A handheld device" (See Page 1, [0011] element 11 wherein Ordinak's PDA is equivalent to Applicant's a handheld device), comprising:

“removable, replaceable, and upgradeable modules including a removable, replaceable, upgradeable, and re-writeable Personal Universal Memory card capable of receiving and storing information” (See Page 1, [0006] and [0011] and Page 2, [0025] wherein Ordinak’s upgradeable, removable and replaceable module and a plug-in memory for storing personalized settings and programs is equivalent to Applicant’s removable, replaceable, and upgradeable modules including a removable, replaceable, upgradeable, and re-writeable Personal Universal Memory card capable of receiving and storing information); and

“a motherboard having sockets to accept the replaceable, and upgradeable modules” (See Page 1, [0006] and [0011] and Page 2, [0025] wherein Ordinak’s upgradeable, removable and replaceable module and a plug for being inserted into a PDA is equivalent to Applicant’s a motherboard having sockets to accept the replaceable, and upgradeable modules).

Ordinak does not specifically teach the information is “associated with a user from a server” or the sockets accept the module is based on “the information associated with the user and on the user-determined hardware configuration of the device through user-selected replaceable, and upgradeable modules, the server downloads only applications that can be supported by the user-determined configuration of removable, replaceable, and upgradeable modules”.

However, Turner teaches the information is “associated with a user from a server” (See Page 1, [0007] wherein Turner’s user profile is stored in the server to establishing

user equipment through user's registration or interaction with the server is equivalent to Applicant's the information is associated with a user from a server); and the sockets accept the module is based on "the information associated with the user and on the user-determined hardware configuration of the device through user-selected replaceable, and upgradeable modules, the server downloads only applications that can be supported by the user-determined configuration of removable, replaceable, and upgradeable modules" (See Page 1, [0006]-[0007] and Page 2, [0015] wherein Turner's user profile is stored in the server to establish user equipment information through user's registration or interaction with the server, and information about end-user's equipment and their configuration is available through the server profile database at the server. Further, end-user is registered as owning devices, and server notifies the user about the new features, software releases for equipment or services upgrade on one or more of the devices, including downloading from the internet is equivalent to Applicant's the information associated with the user and on the user-determined hardware configuration of the device through user-selected replaceable, and upgradeable modules, the server downloads only applications that can be supported by the user-determined configuration of removable, replaceable, and upgradeable modules).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Turner's reference with Ordinak's teaching by maintaining a user profile database at the server for registering user's devices because both references integrate modules and devices into user system and the combination of references would have enabled Ordinak's modular type of system

compatible with the current functionalities and features available for the ever-evolving devices because of upgrade and replacement.

As per claim 2, Ordinak teaches “Personal Universal Memory card is used as an identification card for interaction with a device that requires user information” (see Page 2, [0026] wherein Ordinak’s memory module stored personalized settings, credit card information and personal identification is equivalent to Applicant’s Personal Universal Memory card is used as an identification card for interaction with a device that requires user information).

As per claim 3, Ordinak teaches “the Personal Universal Memory card is used to customize a device to the needs of the consumer” (see Page 2, [0026] wherein Ordinak’s memory module is also used as a security device to enable or disable features of telematic control unit is equivalent to Applicant’s the Personal Universal Memory card is used to customize a device to the needs of the consumer).

As per claim 4, Ordinak teaches “Personal Universal Memory card is credit-card-sized” (See Page 2, [0022] wherein Ordinak’s module device is configured to receive modules such as standard PCMCIA or CF cards is equivalent to Applicant’s Personal Universal Memory card is credit-card-sized).

As per claim 9, Ordinak teaches “wherein the motherboard has a central processing unit (CPU) socket to accept the removable, replaceable, and upgradeable central processing unit” (See Page 1, [0006] and [0011] and Page 2, [0025] wherein Ordinak’s upgradeable, removable and replaceable module and a plug for being inserted into a

PDA is equivalent to Applicant's a motherboard having sockets to accept the replaceable, and upgradeable modules).

As per claim 19, Ordinak teaches the following:

"a computer program product for implementing, in a handheld device wirelessly coupled with a server, a method of initiating a user session with the server from the handheld device, the computer program product" (See Page 1, [0018] and Page 2, [0025]

wherein Ordinak's a wireless communication device transmits and receives wireless information between user and server systems and PDA allows user to initiate user session is equivalent to Applicant's a computer program product for implementing, in a handheld device wirelessly coupled with a server, a method of initiating a user session with the server from the handheld device, the computer program product);

"a computer-readable medium carrying executable instructions that, when executed, are capable of performing the acts of: identifying the presence of a Personal Universal Memory card in the handheld device" (See Page 2, [0025]-[0026] wherein Ordinak's handheld device such as PDA allows user to flexibly transport personalized setting and memory module stores personalized settings and data and also serves as security device is equivalent to Applicant's a computer-readable medium carrying executable instructions that, when executed,

are capable of performing the acts of: identifying the presence of a Personal Universal Memory card in the handheld device); and

"requesting initiation of a user session after the user has been verified as being the owner of the Personal Universal Memory card in the device" (See Page 1, [0018] and

Page 2, [0025]-[0026] wherein Ordinak's handheld device such as PDA allows user to flexibly transport personalized setting and memory module stores personalized settings and data and also serves as security device and a wireless communication device transmits and receives wireless information between user and server systems and PDA allows user to initiate user session is equivalent to Applicant's requesting initiation of a user session after the user has been verified as being the owner of the Personal Universal Memory card in the device).

Ordinak does not specifically teach "receiving and storing, at the handheld device, configuration information that the handheld device allows to be downloaded to it" or "determining and downloading only applications that can be supported by a user-determined configuration of removable, replaceable, and upgradeable modules".

However, Turner further teaches "receiving and storing, at the handheld device, configuration information that the handheld device allows to be downloaded to it" (See Page 1, [0004] and [0006], and Page 2, [0014]-[0016] wherein Turner's memory storage allows device new features and configuration and software be downloaded to user system, including the PDA is equivalent to Applicant's receiving and storing, at the handheld device, configuration information that the handheld device allows to be downloaded to it);

"determining and downloading only applications that can be supported by a user-determined configuration of removable, replaceable, and upgradeable modules" (See Page 1, [0006]-[0007] and Page 2, [0015] wherein Turner's user profile is stored in the server to establish user equipment information through user's registration or interaction

with the server, and information about end-user's equipment and their configuration is available through the server profile database at the server. Further, end-user is registered as owning devices, and server notifies the user about the new features, software releases for equipment or services upgrade on one or more of the devices, including downloading from the internet is equivalent to Applicant's the information associated with the user and on the user-determined hardware configuration of the device through user-selected replaceable, and upgradeable modules, the server downloads only applications that can be supported by the user-determined configuration of removable, replaceable, and upgradeable modules).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Turner's reference with Ordinak's teaching by maintaining a user profile database at the server for registering user's devices because both references integrate modules and devices into user system and the combination of references would have enabled Ordinak's modular type of system compatible with the current functionalities and features available for the ever-evolving devices because of upgrade and replacement.

As per claim 20, Turner further teaches "the executable instructions, when executed, are further capable of performing the act of sending, from the handheld device, coded preference information associated with the user to the server, the coded preference information having been generated in a process at the handheld device" (See Fig. 1 by showing the architecture of server, workstation and hand-held device for performing equipment, device configuration and software status update and feature

upgrade services between user system and server is equivalent to Applicant's the executable instructions, when executed, are further capable of performing the act of sending, from the handheld device, coded preference information associated with the user to the server, the coded preference information having been generated in a process at the handheld device);

"performing the act of receiving, at the server, coded preference information sent by the handheld device, and using the coded preference information to access a database maintained at the server system in order to locate the data with codes that match the coded preference information associated with the user" (See Fig. 1 and Page 2, [0015] by showing the architecture of server, workstation and hand-held device for performing equipment, device configuration and software status update and feature upgrade services between user system and features and registration servers' registration and user profile databases is equivalent to Applicant's performing the act of receiving, at the server, coded preference information sent by the handheld device, and using the coded preference information to access a database maintained at the server system in order to locate the data with codes that match the coded preference information associated with the user).

6. Claims 5-8 are rejected are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Odinak et al. (U.S. Pub. 2002/0173889, hereafter "Odinak") in view of Turner et al. (U.S. Pub. 2003/0191650, hereafter "Turner"), as applied to claims 1-4, and further in view of Tolopka (U.S. Patent 6,044,349, hereafter "Tolopka").

As per claim 5, the combined Turner-Odinak reference teaches a hand-held device with socket for smart card.

The combined reference does not specifically teach "Personal Universal Memory card is used as a credit card, debit card, or ATM card", although Ordinak teaches module device is configured to receive modules such as standard PCMCIA or CF cards (See Page 2, [0022]).

However, Tolopka teaches "Personal Universal Memory card is used as a credit card, debit card, or ATM card" (See col. 1, lines 28-31 and 46-51 wherein Tolopka's utilizing smart card for financial and medical usage is equivalent to Applicant's Personal Universal Memory card is used as a credit card, debit card, or ATM card).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Tolopka's teaching with Turner and Ordinak's references by enabling memory storage card with financial transaction capability because by doing so the card would have been one for multiple-purposes smart card such that user would have been able to use credit card and information flexibly.

As per claim 6, Tolopka further teaches "the Personal Universal Memory card contains a cryptographic key" (See at col. 1, lines 53-60 wherein Tolopka's using encrypted security information on the smart card is equivalent to Applicant's the Personal Universal Memory card contains a cryptographic key).

As per claim 7, Tolopka further teaches "the cryptographic key protects the user's privacy during use" (See col. 1, lines 53-60 and col. 3, lines 36-42 wherein Tolopka's

encrypted security password and encrypted personal identification on the smart card is equivalent to Applicant's the cryptographic key protects the user's privacy during use).

As per claim 8, Tolopka further teaches "wherein the cryptographic key is used to securely store the user's biometric scan on the Personal Universal Memory card for later comparison against user scans conducted for activating a user-session or for conducting transactions" (See col. 3, lines 36-42 wherein Tolopka's encrypted personal identification and/or biometric code stored on the smart card is equivalent to Applicant's wherein the cryptographic key is used to securely store the user's biometric scan on the Personal Universal Memory card for later comparison against user scans conducted for activating a user-session or for conducting transactions).

7. Claims 17-18 are rejected are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ballantyne et al. (U.S. Patent 5,867,821, hereafter "Ballantyne") in view of Tolopka (U.S. Patent 6,044,349, hereafter "Tolopka"), and further in view of Turner et al. (U.S. Pub. 2003/0191650, hereafter "Turner").

As per claim 17, Ballantyne teaches the following:

"computer network that includes a server wirelessly communicating with one or more wireless handheld devices, a method of permitting a particular user to access the computer network from any of the handheld devices" (See Fig. 1, elements 6, the nursing station as the server and element 10 the hand-held device communicating with the server through PCS wirelessly as shown in Fig. 6, elements 100 and 102 and at col. 4, lines 65-67 by communicating servers on the computer network is equivalent to Applicant's computer network that includes a server wirelessly communicating with one

or more wireless handheld devices, a method of permitting a particular user to access the computer network from any of the handheld devices);

“requiring that a Personal Universal Memory card be inserted into the device, requiring the user’s information matches the information stored on the Personal Universal Memory card, and maintaining at the server unique customer identifiers associated with users” (See Fig. 6, elements “Health Card” and PCS, and col. 10, line 58 - col. 11, line 11 wherein Ballantyne’s describing reading and writing health card by matching uniqueness of the patient is equivalent to Applicant’s requiring that a Personal Universal Memory card be inserted into the device, requiring” the user’s information matches the “information stored on the Personal Universal Memory card, and maintaining at the server unique customer identifiers associated with users).

Ballantyne does not specifically teach the biometric information to identify the users.

However, Tolopka teaches “wherein the cryptographic key is used to securely store the user’s biometric scan on the Personal Universal Memory card for later comparison against user scans conducted for activating a user-session or for conducting transactions” (See col. 3, lines 36-42 wherein Tolopka’s encrypted personal identification and/or biometric code stored on the smart card is equivalent to Applicant’s wherein the cryptographic key is used to securely store the user’s biometric scan on the Personal Universal Memory card for later comparison against user scans conducted for activating a user-session or for conducting transactions.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

applicant's invention was made to combine Tolopka references with Ballantyne's teaching by enabling health card with biometric information for identifying user because by doing so the health card would have been the one only for all purposes smart card with high security of protection such that consumers need to carry would not have to acquire a plurality of cards.

Tolopka further teaches "maintaining at the servers unique identifiers associated with a plurality of users of the computer network and establishing the user session without regard to any specific handheld device" at col. 1, lines 53-60 and col. 3, lines 36-42 by using encrypted security password and encrypted personal identification on the smart card.

The combined Tolopka-Ballantyne reference does not specifically teach "determining and downloading only applications that can be supported by a user-determined configuration of removable, replaceable, and upgradeable modules".

However, Turner teaches "determining and downloading only applications that can be supported by a user-determined configuration of removable, replaceable, and upgradeable modules" (See Page 1, [0006]-[0007] and Page 2, [0015] wherein Turner's user profile is stored in the server to establish user equipment information through user's registration or interaction with the server, and information about end-user's equipment and their configuration is available through the server profile database at the server. Further, end-user is registered as owning devices, and server notifies the user about the new features, software releases for equipment or services upgrade on one or more of the devices, including downloading from the internet is equivalent to Applicant's

the information associated with the user and on the user-determined hardware configuration of the device through user-selected replaceable, and upgradeable modules, the server downloads only applications that can be supported by the user-determined configuration of removable, replaceable, and upgradeable modules).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Turner's teaching with Tolopka and Ballantyne references by maintaining a user profile database at the server for registering user's devices because both references integrate modules and devices into user system and the combination of references would have enabled a modular type of system compatible with the current functionalities and features available for the ever-evolving devices because of upgrade and replacement.

As per claim 18, Ballantyne further teaches "at the server, using coded user preferences sent by the handheld device to the server to locate user-preferred data with matching codes" (See col. 10, line 65 – col. 11, line 11 by describing reading and writing health card by matching uniqueness of the patient; and "downloading that data from the server to the selected handheld device based on the device hardware configuration" at col. 11, line 2-4 and 12, lines 37-41 wherein Ballantyne's transferring update information of patient's record to the appropriate work station by tracking the location of the patient is equivalent to Applicant's at the server, using coded user preferences sent by the handheld device to the server to locate user-preferred data with matching codes).

8. Claims 10-16 are rejected are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Odinak et al. (U.S. Pub. 2002/0173889, hereafter "Odinak") in view of

Turner et al. (U.S. Pub. 2003/0191650, hereafter "Turner"), as applied to claims 1-4, and further in view of Nguyen (U.S. Patent 6,401,157, hereafter "Nguyen").

As per claim 10, the combined Turner-Odinak reference teaches "a motherboard having sockets to accept the replaceable, and upgradeable modules" (See Ordinak: Page 1, [0006] and [0011] and Page 2, [0025] wherein Ordinak's upgradeable, removable and replaceable module and a plug for being inserted into a PDA is equivalent to Applicant's a motherboard having sockets to accept the replaceable, and upgradeable modules).

The combined reference does not specifically teach "wherein the motherboard has a Random Access Memory socket to accept the removable, replaceable, and upgradeable Random Access Memory module".

However, Nguyen teaches "wherein the motherboard has a Random Access Memory socket to accept the removable, replaceable, and upgradeable Random Access Memory module" (See col. 5, lines 48-60 wherein Nguyen's motherboard having sockets for removable, replaceable, and upgradeable random access memory chips is equivalent to Applicant's wherein the motherboard has a Random Access Memory socket to accept the removable, replaceable, and upgradeable Random Access Memory module).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Nguyen's teaching with Turner and Ordinak's references by designing the motherboard of the hand-held device with flexibility of removing, replacing and upgrading the random access memory chips

because by doing so the computer system would have been a modularly configured such that device replacement or upgrading could have been performed flexibly.

As per claim 11, Nguyen further teaches “wherein the motherboard has a Read Only Memory socket to accept the removable, replaceable, and upgradeable Read Only Memory module” (See at col. 5, lines 33-41 wherein Nguyen’s motherboard having sockets for removable, replaceable, and upgradeable random access memory chips is equivalent to Applicant’s wherein the motherboard has a Read Only Memory socket to accept the removable, replaceable, and upgradeable Read Only Memory module).

As per claim 12, Nguyen further teaches “wherein the motherboard has a Read Only Memory socket to accept the removable, replaceable, and upgradeable Read Only Memory module” (See Fig. 6, wherein Nguyen’s element Voice Entry is equivalent to Applicant’s wherein the motherboard has a Read Only Memory socket to accept the removable, replaceable, and upgradeable Read Only Memory module).

As per claim 13, Nguyen further teaches “wherein the motherboard has a graphics module socket, further comprising a removable, replaceable, and upgradeable graphics module adapted to be plugged into the graphics module socket” (See col. 5, lines 7-13 wherein Nguyen’s graphic device interface is equivalent to Applicant’s wherein the motherboard has a graphics module socket, further comprising a removable, replaceable, and upgradeable graphics module adapted to be plugged into the graphics module socket).

As per claim 14, Nguyen further teaches “a wireless module socket, further comprising a removable, replaceable, re-writeable, and upgradeable wireless module

adapted to be plugged into the wireless module socket" (See col. 3, lines 1-7 wherein Nguyen's plug-in devices are on hot-plug sockets is equivalent to Applicant's a biometric scanner socket, further comprising a removable, replaceable, re-writeable, and upgradeable biometric scanner adapted to be plugged into the biometric scanner socket).

As per claim 15, Nguyen further teaches "a biometric scanner socket, further comprising a removable, replaceable, re-writeable, and upgradeable biometric scanner adapted to be plugged into the biometric scanner socket" (See col. 3, lines 1-7 wherein Nguyen's plug-in devices are on hot-plug sockets is equivalent to Applicant's a biometric scanner socket, further comprising a removable, replaceable, re-writeable, and upgradeable biometric scanner adapted to be plugged into the biometric scanner socket).

As per claim 16, Nguyen further teaches "a card reader slot to accept the removable, replaceable, re-writeable, and upgradeable Personal Memory card" (See col. 3, lines 1-7 wherein Nguyen's plug-in devices are on hot-plug sockets is equivalent to Applicant's a card reader slot to accept the removable, replaceable, re-writeable, and upgradeable Personal Memory card).

9. The prior art made of record

- A. U.S. Publication 2002/0173889
- B. U.S. Publication 2003/0191650
- C. U.S. Patent 6,044,349
- D. U.S. Patent 5,867,821

E. U.S. Patent 6,401,157

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

F. U.S. Patent 5,630,174

G. U.S. Patent 5,551,102

H. U.S. Publication 2002/0052843

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusions

11. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.

The Applicants are reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. The prior art made of record, listed on form PTO-892, and not relied upon, if any, is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

If a reference indicated as being mailed on PTO-FORM 892 has not been enclosed in this action, please contact Lisa Craney whose telephone number is (571)-272-357 for faster service.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kuen S Lu whose telephone number is 571-272-4114.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM to 5 PM, Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on 571-272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Kuen S. Lu

Patent Examiner

October 20, 2004



Luke Wassum

Primary Examiner

October 20, 2004